



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

A

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/710,927	11/09/2000	Rabindranath Dutta	AUS-2000-0616-US1	5671

7590 10/06/2005
Rudolf O Siegesmund
4627 N Central Expressway
Suite 2000
Dallas, TX 75205-4022

EXAMINER

KE, PENG

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2174

DATE MAILED: 10/06/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/710,927

Applicant(s)

DUTTA ET AL

Examiner

Peng Ke

Art Unit

2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 April 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

AI

DETAILED ACTION

Applicant's arguments, see appeal brief, filed 4/28/04, with respect to claim 1-16 have been fully considered and are persuasive. The final rejection of 12/18/03 has been withdrawn.

The following action is another responsive to communications: Amendment, filed on 9/23/03.

This Action is Final.

Claims 1-16 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 4, 10, 13, and 14 are independent claims. In the Amendment, filed on 9/23/03, claims 1-7, 10, and 12-14, are amended.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 14-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kosaka et al. (JP 11250054).

As per claim 14, Kosaka teaches a computer-implemented process to display and simultaneously update multiple information units comprising:

using a computer, performing the following series of steps:

powering the computer;

connecting said computer to at least one network (It is inherent for a computer to be connected to a network in order for it to access the web pages over the internet);

Art Unit: 2174

displaying a multi-part graphical user interface (GUI) comprising a split screen work area and split screen canvas;

invoking a canvas web page in the split screen canvas (page 13, paragraph 2, 3, and 4);

Examiner interprets extracting objects from first web page to be splitting the web page;

invoking a first web page in the split screen work area;

wherein a user can simultaneously view the split screen work area and split screen canvas (page 13, paragraph 2, 3, and 4);

Examiner interprets dividing the web pages into objects to be splitting web pages into multiple work area;

acquiring data in a data level (page12, paragraph 5, fig 5);

displaying said data levels in a display frame in a first web page (page12, paragraph 5, fig 5);

identifying a first information unit on said first web page (page12, paragraph 5, fig 5).

As per claim 15, Kosaka teaches the computer implemented process of claim 14 further comprising:

using a computer, updating said data level (page 15, paragraph 5).

As per claim 16, Kosaka teaches the computer implemented process of claim 14 further comprising:

using a computer performing the following steps ,

invoking a canvas web page (page 14, paragraph 1);

positioning said first information unit on said canvas (page 14, paragraph 1);

invoking a second web page (page12, paragraph 5, fig 6);

Art Unit: 2174

identifying a second information unit on said second web page (page 14, paragraph 1);

and

positioning said second information unit on said canvas web page (page 14, paragraph 1).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 4, 7-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kosaka et al. (JP 11250054) in view of Emens et al. US Patent 6,493,744.

As per claim 4, Kosaka teaches a method for aggregating multiple information items on a display screen of a computer connected to the internet comprising the steps of:

displaying a multi-part graphical user interface (GUI) comprising a split screen work area and a split screen canvas (page 13, paragraph 2, 3, and 4);

Examiner interprets extracting objects from first web page to be splitting the web page;

invoking a canvas web page in the split screen canvas (page 14, paragraph 1);

invoking a first web page in the split screen work area (page 12, paragraph 5, fig 5);

identifying a first information unit on said first web page so that said first web page is divided into said first information unit and a first web page remainder (page 12, paragraph 5, fig 5);

Art Unit: 2174

invoking a second web page (page12, paragraph 5, fig 5);

identifying a second information unit on said second web page so that said second web page is divided into said second information unit and a second web page remainder (page12, paragraph 5, fig 5); and

wherein a user can simultaneously view the canvas webpage and the first web page on the GUI (Figure 7)

However Kosaka fails to teach rendering the remainder of the webpage transparent (page 13, paragraph 2, 3, 4);

Emens teaches rendering the undesired portions of the webpage invisible. (see Emens column 5 lines 27-column 16)

It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Emens' teaching with the method of Kosaka in order to allow users to view the undesired portion later if they choose to.

As per claim 7, Kosaka and Emen teach the method of claim 4. Kosaka further teaches method comprising saving said canvas web page, said first information unit and said second information unit as a composite web page. (page 14, paragraph 1).

As per claim 8, Kosaka and Emen teach the method of claim 4. Kosaka further teaches method comprising updating said first information unit (page 15, paragraph 5).

As per claim 9, Kosaka and Emen teach the method of claim 4. Ksaka further teaches comprising updating said second information unit (page 15, paragraph 5).

As per claim 10, Kosaka teaches a programmable apparatus for display and simultaneous update of multiple information units comprising, programmable hardware comprising;

Art Unit: 2174

a computer connected to a network (It is inherent for a computer to be connected to a network in order for it to access the web pages over the internet);

a display screen connected to said computer (fig 5);

a program installed on said computer;

wherein responsive to said program containx instruction comprising (page12, paragraph 5, fig 5):

instruction for displaying a multi-part graphical user interface (GUI) comprising a split screen work area and a xplit screen canvas;

instruction for invoking a canvas web page in the split screen canvas (page 13, paragraph 2, 3, and 4);

Examiner interprets extracting objects from first web page to be splitting the web page;

instruction for invoking a first web page in the split screen work area (page 13, paragraph 2, 3, and 4);

wherein a user simultaneously views the split screen work area and the split screen canvas (page 13, paragraph 2, 3, and 4);

Examiner interprets dividing the web pages into objects to be splitting web pages into multiple work areas;

wherein an information unit is identified on the web page (page12, paragraph 5, fig 5);
and

wherein said information unit is moved to a CWP (page 14, paragraph 1).

Wherein the first web page is layered with a second web page on the canvas web page, the second web comprising a second information unit and second web page remainder (figure 5, figure 6, and figure 7);

Wherein the first information unit and the second information unit are visible through the transparent first web page remainder and the transparent second web page remainder (figure 5, figure 6, and figure 7).

However Kosaka fails to teach rendering the remainder of the webpage transparent (page 13, paragraph 2, 3, 4);

Emens teaches rendering the undesired portions of the webpage invisible. (see Emens column 5 lines 27-column 16)

It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Emens' teaching with the method of Kosaka in order to allow users to view the undesired portion later if they choose to.

Claims 1-3, 5, 6, and 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kosaka et al. (JP 11250054) in view of Emens et al. US Patent 6,493,744 in view of Straznitskas.

As per claim 1, Kosaka a method for display of one or more information items comprising the steps of:

invoking a first web page (page 12, paragraph 5, fig 5); and

rendering said first web page remainder transparent (page 13, paragraph 2, 3, 4).

Art Unit: 2174

wherein the first web page is layered with a second web page comprising a second information unit and a second web page remainder (figure 6, item c, figure 7, item c); and

However Kosaka fails to teach the method comprising:

identifying a first information unit by creating a continuous line around a first information item on said web page so that said web page is divided into said first information unit and a first web page remainder.

Straznitskas teaches identifying a first information unit by creating a continuous line around a first information item on a page so that the page is divided into said first information unit and a first page remainder (page 8).

It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Straznitskas' teaching with Kosaka's method in order to allow the user to easily identify the section that he/she regards as important and relevant.

However Kosaka and Straznitskas both fail to teach rendering the remainder of the webpage transparent (page 13, paragraph 2, 3, 4);

Emens teaches rendering the undesired portions of the webpage invisible. (see Emens column 5 lines 27-column 16)

It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Emens' teaching with method Kosaka and Straznitskas in order to allow users to view the undesired portion later if they choose to.

As per claim 2, Kosaka teaches the method of claim 1 further comprising:

invoking the second web page (page 12, paragraph 5, fig 6);

Art Unit: 2174

rendering said second web page remainder transparent (page 13, paragraph 2, 3, 4);
positioning said second information unit relative to said first information unit; and (page 14, paragraph 1).

However Kosaka fails to teach the method comprising
identifying a second information unit by creating a continuous line around a second information item on said second web page so that said second web page is divided into said second information unit and a second web page remainder;

and merging the two units by dragging.

Straznitskas teaches identifying a second information unit by creating a continuous line around a second information item on said second web page so that said second web page is divided into said second information unit and a second web page remainder, and dragging the identified object (page 8).

It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Straznitskas' teaching with Kosaka's method in order to allow the user to easily identify and paste the section that he/she regards as important and relevant.

However Kosaka and Straznitskas both fail to teach rendering the remainder of the webpage transparent (page 13, paragraph 2, 3, 4);

Emens teaches rendering the undesired portions of the webpage invisible. (see Emens column 5 lines 27-column 16)

It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Emens' teaching with method Kosaka and Straznitskas in order to allow users to view the undesired portion later if they choose to.

As per claim 3, Kosaka, Straznitskas, and Emens teach the method of claim 1. Kosaka further teaches comprising:

displaying a multi-part graphical user interface (GUI) comprising a split screen work area and a split screen canvas;

dragging said first information unit to a CWP and positioning said first information unit on the canvas web page; (page 14, paragraph 1).

dragging said first information unit to a canvas web page (page 17, paragraph 4);

positioning said first information unit on the canvas web page (page 17, paragraph 4);

Examiner interprets extracting revising object by a mouse to be drag and drop.

wherein the canvas web page is located on the split screen canvas; and wherein the first web is located on the split screen work area (figure 7).

As per claim 5, Kosaka and Emens teach teaches the method of claim 4. Kosaka further teaches the method comprising taking said first information unit to said canvas web page and positioning said first information unit on the canvas web page (page 14, paragraph 1).

However Kosaka fails to teach merging the two units by dragging.

Straznitskas teaches dragging the identified object (page 8).

It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Straznitskas' teaching with Kosaka's method in order to allow the user to easily paste the section that he/she regards it as important and relevant.

As per claim 6, it is of the same scope as claim 5. (See rejection above).

Art Unit: 2174

As per claim 11, Kosaka, Straznitskas, and Emens teach the apparatus of claim 10.

Kosaka further teaches the programmable wherein said information unit is identified information item on said web page so that said web page is divided into said information unit and a remainder (page 11, fig 5); and

said remainder is rendered transparent (page 13, paragraph 2, 3, 4).

Kosaka fails to teach identified information item by creating a continuous line around it.

Straznitskas teaches identifying a information unit by creating a continuous line around a information item (page 8).

It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Straznitskas' teaching with Kosaka's method in order to allow the user to easily identify the section that he/she regards as important and relevant.

As per claim 12, it is of the same scope as claim 11. (see rejection above)

As per claim 13, Kosaka teaches a computer readable memory for display and simultaneous update of multiple information units comprising:

a computer readable storage medium; (It is inherent for the computer system to have a storage medium)

a computer program stored in said storage medium; (page 8, paragraph 3)

the storage medium, so configured by said computer program, causes the computer ;
to display a multi-part graphical user interface (GUI) comprising a split screen work area and split screen canvas;

to invoke a canvas web page in the split screen canvas;

instruction for invoking a first web page in the split screen work area (page 13, paragraph 2, 3, and 4);

Examiner interprets extracting objects from first web page to be splitting the web page; to acquire a web page from said network and display said web page in a display screen (page12, paragraph 5, fig 5);

to identify an information unit on the web page (page12, paragraph 5, fig 5);

to position said information unit on a canvas web page (page12, paragraph 5, fig 5);

to acquire from said network a second web page (page12, paragraph 5, fig 6);

to identify a second information unit on the second web page (page12, paragraph 5, fig 6);

wherein a user can simultaneously view the split screen work area and the split screen canvas; and

However Kosaka fails to teach the method wherein said program is adapted for dragging of said first information unit and said second information unit by a user, so that responsive to said dragging, said program positions said first information unit on said canvas web page and positions said second information unit on said canvas web page so that said canvas web page is visible through said first remainder and said second remainder and said first information unit is visible through said second remainder.

Straznitskas teaches dragging the identified object (page 8).

It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Straznitskas' teaching with Kosaka's method in order to allow the user to easily paste the section that he/she regards as important and relevant.

However Kosaka and Straznitskas both fail to teach rendering the remainder of the webpage transparent (page 13, paragraph 2, 3, 4);

Emens teaches rendering the undesired portions of the webpage invisible. (see Emens column 5 lines 27-column 16)

It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Emens' teaching with method Kosaka and Straznitskas in order to allow users to view the undesired portion later if they choose to.

Response to Argument

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-16 have been considered but are deemed to be moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Peng Ke whose telephone number is (571) 272-4062. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th and Alternate Fridays 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine L. Kincaid can be reached on (571) 272-4063. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Peng Ke

Kristine Kincaid
KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100